

David Schattilly, AD7BK
PO BOX 520
Tacoma, Wa 98401-0520

Comment about BPL.

I am against BPL in its current form (2-80 MHz version) although Tacoma isn't looking at it. The surrounding communities may take the task of getting it which is going to ruin HF completely. The ARRL and many countries proved that BPL is a wide spread interference problem. Now if you made it go to the 5 GHz range, I would not mind in fact it would eliminate all interference problems that the 2-80 MHz version would cause. Please I implore you to have BPL go to the 5GHz range since it wouldn't go near as far to interfere other than right under the power lines. Many Countries dropped it because of the interference problems. But it seems that you at the FCC have not taken any of the PROOF to heart and said it is ok to do BPL even at the PART 15 limitations. This will lead to many complaints about CBers, AMATEUR RADIO ops and any LICENSED services interfering with the BPL and visa versa. In the long run BPL is a bad choice for broadband. We can do fiber to the home but it may be too expensive but in the long run with FTTH it would end up a cheaper and better solution than the current BPL method. I am very shocked that the FCC doesn't care about the LICENSED services and Broadcasters along with TV Broadcasters (Channels 2-5). Who provide a major part of the monetary resources. It seems a political or rather a greased move to get BPL to become a reality. How much money did the Power companies and the BPL Modem makers give the FCC to have this to become a reality? I am also going to write my Senator, and the congress this letter. The Federal Communications Commission has a obligation to protect the LICENSED services. BPL will destroy all of HF and LOW VHF meaning that 160-6M ham bands are no more. TV Channels 2-5 off the air will not be seen when someone near is using BPL. most everyone is within 10-50 feet of overhead power lines. Kids won't be able to have their R/C hobby near power lines. Why did you the FCC approve the use of BPL? Why? Money. You care less about the licensed services, you the FCC don't care about emergency communications. (Sure they say use VHF) VHF and UHF don't propergate at all. HF does. Which means even if you're NOT in a BPL area you will still hear it from 3000mi away if conditions are right. Homeland security will not be able to communicate Red Cross, Local EOCs, ARES/RACES, MARS, CAP, Coast Guard (For emergencies on the seas since they use HF for long range communications), some police even use HF for communications. You have violated a sacred trust between the FCC and the LICENSED users of the spectrum.

BPL will ultimately destroy what is the best form of COMMUNICATIONS DURING A DISASTER! when it comes to a time when long range communications are nessisary, BPL will prevent it. People may also get hurt when a neighbor gets so fed up with a Ham Next door that they do what they can to stop the interference like pulling antennas down, even go as far as getting into a brawl or someone may go as far as to kill someone who uses the HF band because of the inherent

violent tendencies we as people have. Anger is a very dangerous weapon in resolving an issue. And what if the POLICE use HF for their radio system? They can't hear the officer responding because of BPL. (This is a scenario at its absolute worst).

BPL IS A BAD IDEA IN ITS CURRENT FORM TO USE THE HF/VHF BANDS FOR ITS MODE OF COMMUNICATIONS 5 GHz IS THE BEST WAY TO HAVE BPL, SURE IT IS MORE COSTLY BUT IT IS PROTECTING THE HF/VHF BANDS FROM INTERFERENCE. I IMPLORE YOU THE FCC TO CHANGE YOUR MIND OR TO MAKE A RULING THAT IT HAS TO USE THE 5GHz RANGE!